

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 5, 8 – 10, 13, 14 and 17 are pending in the application. Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16, 18 and 19 are canceled by the present amendment. Applicants are requesting reconsideration of the present application.

On 28 MAR 2008, Applicants conducted a teleconference with Examiner Pitaro. Applicants thank Examiner Pitaro for making time for the teleconference.

In the Office Action, claims 1 – 4, 6 – 11, 14 – 16, 18 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over a document concerning Allegro three-state (hereinafter “the Allegro document”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0093523 to Ashe et al. (hereinafter “the Ashe et al. publication”). Additionally, claims 5, 12, 13 and 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the Allegro document and the Ashe et al. publication in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,029,198 to Iizuka (hereinafter “the Iizuka patent”).

The application contains three independent claims, namely claims 1, 8 and 14. During the aforementioned teleconference, Applicants presented a proposed amendment, and Examiner Pitaro agreed that the proposed amendment would distinguish the claims over the art of record. Applicants are herein presenting the claims as agreed during the teleconference.

Applicants are rewriting claims 1, 8 and 14 to include features that were previously presented in other claims.

Claim 1 provides for a system in which a component of a graphical user interface (GUI) is a checkbox, wherein:

- (a) when the checkbox is selected and enabled, the checkbox is rendered on the GUI as a square filled with white and a black check inside the square,
- (b) when the checkbox is unselected and enabled, the checkbox is rendered on the GUI as a square filled with white, and

- (c) when the checkbox is unselected and disabled, the checkbox is rendered on the GUI as a square filled with gray.

The Allegro document describes a check-box having three states, one of which is a grayed-out state that is used to indicate that a true-or-false value is unknown or undetermined, or that some but not all of a set of subchoices are selected (lines 10 - 13). Although the Allegro document describes a check-box, the gray state that indicates that a value is unknown or undetermined is inconsistent with a situation that when the checkbox is **unselected and disabled**, the checkbox is rendered on the GUI as a square filled with **gray** as now recited in claim 1. Thus, the Allegro document cannot be asserted in a rejection of claim 1.

Whereas the Allegro document cannot be asserted in a rejection of claim 1, claim 1 is patentable over the cited combinations of (a) the Allegro document and the Ashe et al. publication, and (b) the Allegro document, the Ashe et al. publication and the Iizuka patent.

Claims 8 and 14 include recitals similar to that of claim 1. Hence, claims 8 and 14, for reasoning similar to that provided in support of claim 1, are also patentable over the cited combinations of references.

Claims 2 and 5 depend from claim 1. Claims 9, 10, 12 and 13 depend from claim 8. Claim 17 depends from claim 14. By virtue of these dependencies, claims 2, 5, 9, 10, 12, 13 and 17 are also patentable over the cited combinations of references.

Claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16, 18 and 19 are canceled. As such, the rejection thereof is rendered moot.

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and a withdrawal of the rejections of the claims.

As mentioned above, Applicants are rewriting claims 1, 8 and 14 to include features that were previously presented in other claims. Applicants are amending claims 5 and 17 to improve their form.

Also in this amendment, Applicants are canceling claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16, 18 and 19. Applicants are not conceding that the subject matter encompassed by claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16, 18 and 19 is not patentable. Applicants are canceling claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16, 18 and 19 solely to facilitate expeditious prosecution of the remaining claims. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to prosecute claims 3, 4, 6, 7, 11, 15, 16, 18 and 19, and additional claims, in one or more continuing applications.


In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims presented in this application patentably distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and that this application be passed to allowance.

Since this amendment neither raises new issues nor requires further consideration, entry is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner deems that the present amendment does not place the application in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request that it be entered for the purpose of appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

Date

4/8/08



Paul D. Greeley

Reg. No. 31,019

Attorney for the Applicants

Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.

One Landmark Square, 10th Floor

Stamford, CT 06901-2682

Tel: 203-327-4500

Fax: 203-327-6401